

AAAS embraces ecology, depopulation

The annual conference of this prestigious scientific organization sponsored every kook from chaos theorists to eugenicists. Marianna Wertz reports.

The 157th annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science could not have occurred at a more appropriate time: right in the middle of George Bush's genocidal war against Iraq. From Feb. 14-19, the nation's most prestigious science organization debated the science policy for Bush's "new world order"—best exemplified in terms of its *intended* effects by the 3 million Iraqi children now starving to death as a result of U.S. "scientific" bombing of Iraq.

Dr. D. Allan Bromley, who today heads the Office of Science and Technology Policy for the Bush administration, enunciated nearly a decade ago, in his 1982 address to the AAAS, the science policy for what Bush today calls the new world order. In Bromley's address as president of the AAAS, he declared, "Human population growth is the most deadly specter looming over us today, and its control one of our greatest challenges. . . . Crucial human values are involved here; in the last analysis we are balancing freedom to reproduce against the quality of subsequent life—if not, indeed, against that life, itself—in those areas of the world where starvation is a constant threat. The technology is at hand . . . to turn off human fertility unless an antidote is taken. I see no other solution ahead."

Malthusian technocracy

That was 1982. At this year's AAAS conference, reflecting the nearly complete takeover of American science policy by the Anglo-American banking elite that runs the environmentalist movement, the "science" presented in hundreds of papers no longer debated whether the population needs to be reduced, but by what "technology," as Dr. Bromley put it. The malthusian monster, whose two heads are environmentalism and depopulation, dominated the conference in virtually every respect.

Not accidentally, one of the major contributors at this year's conference was Anna Roosevelt, granddaughter of President Teddy Roosevelt, who is currently director of the Lower Amazon Project of the Department of Anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York. The museum's front entrance sports a large equestrian statue of her grandfather surrounded by "noble savages."

It was Teddy Roosevelt who believed that "the prime duty, the inescapable duty, of the good citizen of the right

type is to leave his or her blood behind him in the world; and that we have no business to permit the perpetuation of the citizens of the wrong type."* Museum of Natural History was at the center of promoting eugenics and "race science" in America during the half-century leading up to Hitler's 1933 accession to power in Germany, when he put into practice the ideas advocated by Roosevelt.

Anna Roosevelt, "the blood" Teddy left behind him, is following in her grandfather's footsteps. Roosevelt's panels, like most of the conference, focused attention on environmental issues, like "concern" for the Amazon rain forest, which Anglo-American banking interests are using as cover for their intention to grab the mineral wealth of Brazil.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science has a broad-based membership of over 135,000 and considerable national policy influence, wielded at the top levels through its officials and at large through its weekly magazine, *Science* (circulation 153,000). For biologists, in particular, membership in the AAAS and publication of research papers in *Science* is taken for granted as a prerequisite for academic respectability. In general, both *Science* and the AAAS conferences set the trends in science for the nation's scientists, especially in schools and universities.

The AAAS historically has served as a conveyor of British malthusian views, having been formed as a branch of the British Association for the Advancement of Science during the 1880s. Nor is "race science" a stranger to the AAAS. Alexander Graham Bell, who bought the magazine *Science* out of bankruptcy and linked it formally to the AAAS in 1894, later became the honorary president of the International Eugenics Congress (headquartered at the American Museum of Natural History in New York.) *Science* regularly covered the meetings and theories of the eugenics movement through the 1930s.

Panels emphasize cutting population

The twin themes of this year's conference were environmentalism and population control, with related emphasis on drug legalization. A brief review of some of the conference panel presentations makes this clear.

**Eugenics and the Progressives*, by Donald K. Pickens, Vanderbilt University Press, 1968, p. 121.



Alexander Graham Bell bought up the bankrupt Science magazine and formally made it the AAAS organ in 1894. Bell was a leading member of the International Eugenics Congress. His paper above appeared in 1914 in the Journal of Heredity.

Energy; Technology, the only panel on new energy technologies, featured “Scientific Advances in Emerging Solar Energy Technologies,” which included “Development of Biomass Energy Crops,” “Conversion of Lignocellulose to Fuels and Chemicals,” and three papers on photovoltaic cell technologies.

Despite the urgent need to develop large-scale energy generators for the world’s cities, not one mention of nuclear fission or fusion power was made in this panel.

Anna Roosevelt was organizer for the “technical panel” in this area on “Geophysical Imaging Systems: From Medical Microcosm to Outer Space,” in which she presented a paper on “Solar-powered Geophysical Survey at Archaeological Sites in Brazil.” Her paper focuses on methods for surveying prehistoric settlements in northern Brazil, the excavation of which is a pretext for preventing the development of that nation.

The panel on **Geoscience; Climate** began with 13 papers on “Human Response to Sea-Level Rise,” the expected result of the “global warming” hoax. A “technical” section on “Global Change and the Carbon Cycle in Terrestrial Ecosystems” had five more papers on the expected result of the bogus “greenhouse effect” on global warming.

The next panel, “Global Change,” started off with seven papers on “Making Informed Decisions for Planet Earth,” devoted to the use of satellite observations for “improving environmental decision-making” and the “development and enforcement of international environmental agreements.”

A sub-panel on the “Effects of Human Activity on the Global Ecosystem” featured such apocalyptic topics as “Non-linear Dynamics and Chaos: Implications for a Brave New World” and “Catastrophe or Maturity in Century 21.” The

author of this latter paper, Kenneth E. Boulding of the University of Colorado, asserts that “whether the world as a whole can achieve economic and social maturity without catastrophe, in the light of the human population explosion, is a difficult and agonizing question. . . . We must work to avoid catastrophe and, if in some degree it cannot be avoided, to look beyond it.”

And they call this ‘science’?

The reader should keep in mind that this was not a convention of Greenpeace. This was a convention of the *most prestigious* science organization in America. And it gets even worse.

The panel on “Environment” (as if it wasn’t covered in every other panel), has the following sub-topics, each with five to seven papers:

- Science: A Basis for Environmental Policy?
- Is Superfund Working? (Superfund is the nation’s environmental program to clean up abandoned and uncontrolled hazardous waste sites);
- Assessing the Impacts of Nuclear Waste Facilities: The State of the Art Updated;
- Cleaning Up the Mess at the DOE Nuclear Weapons Complex.

And just in case you thought that wasn’t enough, the panel on **Economics and Competitiveness** features World Bank spokesman Herman E. Daly, with a paper on “Sustainable Growth: An Impossibility Theorem.” According to Daly, who should win the malthusian prize for this conference, “The economy is an open subsystem of the Earth ecosystem which is finite, nongrowing and materially closed. A growing economic subsystem incorporates an ever greater

proportion of the total ecosystem system into itself and must reach a limit at 100%, if not before. Therefore its growth is not sustainable. The term 'sustainable growth' when applied to the economy is a bad oxymoron—self-contradictory as prose.”

One might suggest that the author is himself an oxymoron—or maybe just a moron.

'Life sciences' from the World Bank

Then we come to **Life Sciences**. The Nazi race scientists would have found these panels of much interest. The first panel is almost exclusively devoted to new and “scientific” ways to control birth: the “progesterone antagonist,” “immunocontraception,” and a “birth control vaccine,” are all explored in multiple papers.

“Health Care and Policy” is devoted largely to papers mapping the “geographic diffusion of the AIDS epidemic,” which one might consider useful, if there were also some interest evinced in stopping its spread, which there isn't, at least not at this conference.

Just in case the conference participants didn't yet get the message, there is a panel on “Ecology and Evolution,” which treats the “ecosystem” as an organic being and asks the question, “Defining Ecosystem Health: Science, Economics, or Ethics?” with ten papers devoted to this topic alone.

A sub-topic of “Ecology and Evolution” is “Stakes in the Tropical Forests,” organized by Robert L. Randall, director of something called “RainForest ReGeneration,” of Washington, D.C. A paper from another World Bank employee, Robert Goodland, “presents the case for urgent transition to sustainability” (the environmentalist codeword for zero-growth technologies) in the world's rain forests. According to the AAAS summary, Dr. Goodland recently addressed the Vatican's Pontifical Academy of Sciences in Rome on the “ethics of tropical deforestation, i.e., on the linkages between the Church's teachings, population growth, poverty, and pressures on natural resources such as tropical forests. Dr. Goodland was principally responsible for the environmental assessment for the Trans Amazon Highway in Brazil in the mid-1970s.”

Hungry? Take drugs

One could go on for pages with such examples. However, the point is perhaps more economically made by referring to the panel on the “Ethnography of Drug Use in Traditional and Modern Societies.” Under the general rubric of anthropology, the advocates of legalized drugs delivered six papers praising various aspects of legalized drug cultivation and use.

In “Use of Psychoactive Plants in Amerindian Civilization,” Wade Davis of the New York Botanical Gardens argues that “indigenous peoples have successfully used powerful drugs in socially constructive ways for hundreds if not thousands of years.”

Melanie Dreher of the University of Massachusetts at

Amherst reports, in a paper on “Marijuana, Pregnancy, and Child Health and Development in Jamaica,” on “substance use and its subsequent effects on child health and development” in Jamaica and “challenge[s] the concepts and theories developed in a North American context.”

Perhaps the most outrageous of these papers is titled “CRACK: A Vehicle for Long Denied Masculinity in the Inner City,” by Tony Whitehead, Department of Anthropology, University of Maryland, College Park. Whitehead argues that “the illegal selling of crack is providing young African-American men with the means of acquiring money and expressing long-desired masculinity.” Undoubtedly Baltimore Mayor Kurt Schmoke, who advocates drug legalization and the distribution of free needles to addicts, had his hand in this one.

Police state destruction of science

It is perhaps not ironic that the only real reflection offered the conference on how far science has descended under the “condominium” policies of the new world order promoted by AAAS was given by a Soviet science reporter, in a paper on “Eastern European Perspectives on Sustainable Development.” In the synopsis of her speech, Helene Knorre of the Moscow Science Writers Association recalled the days when science was “honest” and “important”:

“When I began working as a science writer nearly 25 years ago, it was a somewhat political choice. In those years of diktat and arbitrary rule, science writing was a sphere in which one could be really honest and write frankly about what one considered important and useful to people. . . . In those years, also, interest in science was great enough so that our profession was considered prestigious, even elitist. The situation has now changed drastically. Science writing has lost its prestige and become a third-rate, even risky, profession. People are concerned about the economic problems, crisis phenomena, and critical ecological situation in the country, but stories about science, either its achievements or recommendations, cause irritation and enmity. Science, and scientists, are blamed for all troubles and disasters, all catastrophes and failures. Since Chernobyl, it has become popular to revile technical progress. Indeed, it may even be dangerous to offer scientific solutions, for your good name can be defamed and you can be charged with almost anything.”

If this view of science in the glasnost environment of today's Soviet Union is surprisingly familiar to real scientists in America today, it is only because America is increasingly becoming *like* the police state of the Soviet Union. Real science has been abandoned in both nations, in favor of the false gods of Mother Earth and drugs.

A real “glasnost” or “openness” in both East and West would *clean out* the environmentalist fakers and commit mankind to the application of science and technology to such real problems as feeding the hungry, stopping AIDS, and exploring the universe.